

**CA-NEV Tahoe Basin Fire Commission
Community Fire Safety Committee Meeting
Lake Tahoe Community College
South Lake Tahoe, CA
January 24, 2008**

1. Call to Order

Committee Chairperson Ruben Grijalva called meeting to order at 9:13 am.

Roll Call taken

Members present:

Ruben Grijalva, Chair, California Dept. of Forestry & Fire Protection (Cal Fire)
Bob Davidson, Vice-Chair, Lake Tahoe Basin Homeowner
Leo Drozdoff, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection
Bud Hicks, Glenbrook Homeowners Association
Ron McIntyre, North Lake Tahoe Resort Association
Jeff Michael, Lake Valley Fire Protection District
John Pickett, Nevada Fire Safe Council
Cindy Tuck, California Environmental Protection Agency
James Wright, State of Nevada Fire Marshal
Jane Schmidt, Natural Resources Conservation Service
Ed Smith, University of Nevada Cooperative Extension

Absent members:

John Koster, Harrah's
Kit Bailey, USFS

2. Review of previous actions taken

Committee Chair Ruben Grijalva reads the (3) Findings & (7) Recommendations.

Three Findings:

1. The Committee recommends that the Commission find that the messages that have been given, a compromise between BMPs and defensible space, are confusing to homeowners.
2. Committee recommends that the Commission find that overlapping federal, state, and local regulatory bodies have led to regulatory uncertainty in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The result has been inadequate defensible space posing a fire risk on many public and private lands.
3. Committee recommends that the Commission find that overlapping federal, state, and local regulations have resulted in increased costs and delays in implementation of fuel treatments in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Recommendations

1. This Committee shall request that the full Commission adopt and recommend to the Governors adopt the priorities of life, property, and the environment, in that order, with respect to fire safety, fire prevention, and such other matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission.
2. That fire protection experts, including fire chiefs and any related experts in the Tahoe basin, establish and implement a basin-wide fire protection standard of defensible space similar to 4291 standard, once adopted, be free from regulatory penalty, once established.
3. That environmental experts recommend appropriate ignition resistant ground cover that meets the fire protection expert's standard for fuel removal and/or is fire ignition resistant cover that they would approve.
4. It is imperative that all agencies develop a basin-wide collaborative effort in setting priorities with strategic fuel reductions, projects, ensuring the projects are complimentary to each other and projects are based upon threat and values at risk. All approved.
5. The Commission recommends that all requirements for permits in the WUI be eliminated and that the fuels treatments proposed are performed with life, safety, property, and environment as the basis and findings for these said treatments.
6. CAL FIRE to evaluate taking back its direct protection responsibilities in the Tahoe Basin, including an analysis of the need for chief officers, engines, fire crews, dozers, aircraft, and fire prevention staff.
7. Ask the US Forest Service to consider how they might make their response times more equal without degrading their services and report back to the Committee.

Recommendation #4

It was noted that documentation from the Commission meeting held January 15, 2008 showed Recommendations #3 and Recommendation #4 as duplicates. This was a typographical error.

Recommendation #4 should read as follows:

It is imperative that all agencies develop a basin-wide collaborative effort in setting priorities with strategic fuel reductions, projects, ensuring the projects are complimentary to each other and projects are based upon threat and values at risk.

Language is recorded correctly in January 14, 2008 minutes.

Recommendation #5

Motion made by Jeff Michael, 2nd by Leo Drozdoff to discuss and amend language.

Language amended to add the term “wildland fuel reduction relating to fuel reduction activities” to the recommendation.

Recommendation now reads as follows:

The Committee recommends that all requirements for wildland fuel reduction permits, relating to fuel reduction activities in the WUI of the Lake Tahoe Basin, be eliminated. And further recommend that NEPA and/or CEQA permits would suffice in meeting or exceeding all permit requirements.

Friendly amendment by Bud Hicks to further amend language. Makers of motion, Jeff Michael and Leo Drozdoff agree to further amending language.

Recommendation now reads:

The Committee recommends that all requirements for permits relating to fuel reduction activities in the WUI of the Lake Tahoe Basin be eliminated. Further recommend that NEPA and/or CEQA permits will suffice in meeting or exceeding all permit requirements.

Motion made by John Pickett, 2nd by Cindy Tuck to table recommendation until F&R by Wildland Fuels Committee is presented. All approved.

John Pickett will provide F&R number to the Wildland Fuel Committee.

Ron McIntyre requests that Wildland Fuel Committee Permit Application Group make presentation.

More discussion on this recommendation will be held at the next meeting with the presentation on F&R V-010, Permit Streamlining.

Recommendation # 2

Motion made by Bud Hicks, 2nd by Ron McIntyre to amend language.

Language amended to read as follows:

The Committee recommends that a basin-wide fire protection standard, similar to the standard set forth in the California Public Code Section 4291, be developed with the assistance of the Tahoe Basin Fire Chiefs and be adopted by all appropriate government authorities that have jurisdiction in the Basin.

Recommendation tabled until this afternoon for John Pickett and Bud Hicks to work on new language and further discussion.

Finding # 1

It was noted that there was a typographical error regarding the term “BNP”.

It was noted to change the term to “BMP” so that the finding reads as follows:

The Committee recommends that the Commission finds that the messages that have been given, a compromise between BMPs and defensible space, are confusing to homeowners.

Duane Shintaku reviews that the Commission has voted on the format and template on how to process findings and recommendations. Findings & recommendations will need to include impacts and implementation before the Commission will adopt F&Rs. Committee Chair Ruben Grijalva wants to know if the narrative provided (minutes) will be enough to incorporate into the findings & recommendations. Duane Shintaku states that the Commission is looking at the specifics i.e. cost related issues to be assured that the Committee has reviewed these issues before sending on to the Commission.

Recommendation # 1

Motion by Ron McIntyre, 2nd by Bob Davidson to move recommendation to the Commission.

Motion made by Bob Davidson, 2nd by Ron McIntyre to delete 'adopt and' from recommendation. All approved.

The recommendation now reads as follows:

The Committee shall request the full Commission recommend that the Governors adopt the priorities of life, property, and the environment, in that order, with respect to fire safety, fire prevention, and such other matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission.

Motion by Bob Davidson, 2nd by Jeff Michael to propose finding.

Finding:

The Committee finds it appropriate for the Commission to adopt priorities in connection with its work.

Ron McIntyre requests to move forward finding. All approved.

Bob Davidson will work on impacts & implementations for finding.

Recommendation tabled to this afternoon for further language.

3. Review of non-Commission proposed finding/recommendations

F&R V-009 - Lake Tahoe Basin Fire Chiefs Presentation "*Wildland Response in the Lake Tahoe Basin*" CFSC-023

The "Balance of Acres" arrangement between Federal fire agencies and CALFIRE was discussed. Under the "Balance of Acres" agreement the USFS provides wildland fire suppression 8-12 hours a day, but does not have structure protection as part of their mission. CAL FIRE has evolved into an all-risk 24/7 department with responsibility for structure protection. Concern was expressed that the "Balance of Acres" is no longer adequate because of the increased risk of catastrophic fire in the Tahoe Basin Wildland Urban Interface.

4. Review of non-Commission proposed findings/recommendations (continued)

Fire Protection Responsibilities of the USFS Joe Millar CFSC-024

Response to 5 questions asked by Committee Chair Ruben Grijalva on September 11, 2007.

Mr. Millar explains that USFS is governed under National Policy. They can not represent themselves as a structure fire protection agency. They work to protect structures from advancing wildland fires. They also work in conjunction with the agencies to fight fires but must stay within their scope of authority. They can not represent themselves as all risk. The USFS and CAL FIRE missions are similar but not equivalent. Their mission involves protection of life, property and resources. How mission is accomplished is agency specific because of authorities and responsibilities of each agency.

Mr. Millar further explains that it is CALFIRE's responsibility to tell USFS how they are performing, under the California Fire Protection Agreement. Level of Service is CAL FIRE term, not USFS. Level of Service from the USFS is assessed by CAL FIRE. CAL FIRE has asked the USFS for their performance records. They are being prepared and getting ready to present them back to CAL FIRE. USFS has Fire Management Plan that has a staffing action guide to augment resources as needed. This system is what is used for 24/7 coverage. 24/7 coverage is not a requirement under current agreement between CAL FIRE and Federal Agencies. The Forest Service augmented the Basin to allow the staffing of 4 engines and 1 crew. USFS, being a National agency, allows the USFS to grab resources from all agencies. Issues come up relating to the lack of helicopter and air tankers based in the Basin. USFS has a 4 party agreement which includes Cal Fire, BLM, Park Service and the USFS. Also, they have an agreement under CFAA that allows USFS to use Office of Emergency Services. USFS also has agreements that go out to OES and Local Fire Departments. Local Fire Chiefs can use the Mass Mutual Aid System.

Mr. Millar asks the Committee that when they make findings and recommendations that they make them so that they are less agency and more of an interagency group. He has concerns that we are moving away from good working relationship.

Ron McIntyre asks Mr. Millar: Would have the response been different on the Angora fire if CAL FIRE and USFS had not had the balance of acreage agreement?

Mr. Millar responds that USFS prioritizes the resources with other agencies throughout Northern California. This information is then sent to Boise. No fire was a higher priority than the Angora fire, at that time.

John Pickett asks who would bear the share of cost in fighting fire.

Mr. Millar responds that there are a number of ways to determine cost sharing. Jurisdictional cost comes into play in who has the responsibility of the land. All agencies come to the table and commit to what they can. It is a very complex issue.

Committee Chair Ruben Grijalva discusses issue on who is making land use decisions. State does not make decisions on SRAs. Local government does. This is done without talking to the State and Federal government. Cost borne for fighting fires is passed on to State and Federal government. On a National level, office of the GAO, why should Federal government pay for the fire protection if they are not involved in decisions? Same discussion is taking place in the State Legislature.

SRA fees have been looked at as well as different ways of passing cost back to areas. This may not be a good approach because it damages the relationship between local and state government and their ability to work together. Reimbursements to local governments are made through agreements, FEMA and emergency declarations. Seven Points of Light is a policy document signed by the Director of Cal Fire and the Director of the Office of Emergency Services that states that help will be given to local governments despite the cost. A cost appropriate agreement to work out details is done later.

Jim Wright asked about the resource/production abilities on type 3 fire engines and the staffing. Mr. Millar responded that USFS currently has 5 type 3 fire engines, crew of 20 and helicopters, vary according to type of helicopter. Budget cuts and hiring vary staffing levels.

Leo Drozdoff asks that after viewing the Fire Chief's Power Point Presentation, do you think the Balance of Acres is antiquated.

Mr. Millar responds that based on the Esperanza fire and loss of life in October 2007, USFS is reviewing their practices. USFS and CAL FIRE will be conducting a review of DPA and SRA lands to see if USFS will continue to do business as they do now. Review process will include USFS, BLM, Park Service and Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Jane Schmidt asks what the USFS role is in defensible space evaluation.

Mr. Millar responds that the Office of General Counsel has a concern about the ability of the USFS to enforce this within the current agreement. The USFS is continuing to seek clarification because the issue goes beyond defensible space, include fire investigation on private lands.

Lunch 1220 Reconvene 1315

Fire Protection Responsibilities (continued)

Committee Chair Ruben Grijalva explains Balance of Acres and terms attached to it. SRA is State Responsibility Area, FRA is Federal Responsibility Area, LRA is Local Responsibility Area and DPA is Direct Protection Area. Balance of Acres is based on efficiency. Balance of Acres drives the approach on what agency begins the initial attack and how the fire is fought. Even though each agency has different priorities that are policy driven in fighting fires, all agencies work together to complete the mission.

Joe Millar explains that structures on FRA are fought from the exterior to prevent from spreading to the forest. This is how fires on the Federal DPA in the Basin are handled. Structure fires are not fought by the USFS. They will call the appropriate resources up to help fight the fire. The only Federal Agency that has authorization by Congress to fight structure fire is the Park System. The USFS's priorities are life, property and resources. Resources are ordered up to help, after initial attack. Issue arises between performances vs. responsibility. Redeployment of air assets was ordered up in early May. Air assets are based on predictive needs and placed in the best location to provide coverage. Since the Balance of Acres agreement from 20+ years ago was initiated, developments have grown and no consideration has been given to what was on acres. Value of land exchanged to the state versus to what has been received back could be vastly different. Two examples of how the land has changed since the agreement began are the Tahoe Basin and Lake Arrowhead.

Mr. Grijalva asks if lookouts would have made a difference in the early detection of the Angora fire, a question that was also raised by John Koster in the last meeting. Chief Whitelaw responds that due to availability of cell phone access in the Basin now, any opinion on lookouts would be speculation only.

John Pickett affirms with Mr. Millar that the spreadsheet provided in Joe's letter shows that the amount of engines to be provided are based on acres protected, as opposed to LTB Fire Chief Whitelaw who based his presentation on 51 square miles of National, State and private land. Question whether population is included in the equation.

Mr. Millar would need to review and get back with the answer. Increase in population would not change the resource allocation on a permanent basis, but USFS staff has the ability to access the situation and augment resources as needed.

John Pickett poses question to Committee Chair Ruben Grijalva about CAL FIRE, if brought back to basin, what model would be used to evaluate and determine what assets would be required to staff locations?

Mr. Grijalva explains that an evaluation of the appropriate amount of resources would need to be done to provide the answer. Mr. Grijalva further explained how contract counties are used to protect SRA. CAL FIRE does an evaluation of assets that would be needed to protect the county. This model is used then to pay the county contract.

Question by John Pickett on whether population is part of the equation.

Mr. Grijalva introduces Bill Hoehman and poses question to him. Bill Hoehman does not have answer. Mr. Grijalva refers question to Jim Wright. According to Mr. Wright, evaluation is based on acreage, not population.

Mr. Grijalva states that CAL FIRE in the SRA had a different mission when these agreements were made. It was not an all risk mission. CAL FIRE moved into all risk, especially when contracts were picked up. At present there are 170 contracts worth about \$300 million.

Mr. Grijalva explains that the charge to the Director of CAL FIRE, under the PRC, along with the integration of SFM into CAL FIRE, who has structure protection under the health and safety code expanded role of CAL FIRE into all risk. Roll was further expanded by integration into CAL FIRE of Office of Emergency Services who has the authority to mission task any State Agency to take on certain responsibilities i.e. floods, landslides, earthquakes. The Governor does not care what the break out of land is, rather that the responsibility is to protect all people of California.

John Pickett questions whether local jurisdiction will be charged, by CAL FIRE, for additional services such as all risk and 24/7 provided.

Mr. Grijalva responds that the counties that surround the Tahoe Basin, Amador, El Dorado and Nevada are counties that have not been contracted away. Some responsibilities have been given over to Federal agencies by a Balance of Acres agreement. If we look at the recommendations by Fire Chiefs to serve the Tahoe Basin and not consider funding, at this point, one option would be to take back the Balance of Acres, 44 thousand acres. Without the Balancing of Acres we would have to build the infrastructure and fire stations. The time involved in doing this would need to be factored in as well. The second option would be to have additional staffing during fire season. Mr. Grijalva states that he has talked to some fire chiefs and they have space for engines, staffed by CALFIRE 24/7. If CAL FIRE came to the Basin, it would be 24/7. That is how CALFIRE operates. Funding would be provided either by augmenting the CALFIRE budget or by Governor's Executive Order. Every year we put before the Governor an Executive Order for fire conditions. After the 2003 fire storm the Governor augmented the staffing in Southern California year round.

Mr. Grijalva further explains that there are a number of ways things have been done, that could be done, and recommendations that could be made to do, I am not telling you which are the best, but just what your options are. Mr. Grijalva states that the harder option would be to take back and build infrastructure. The easier and more readily accessible option is seasonal staffing, co-located with local government and additional people to do defensible space inspections. This last year, based on the Governors Executive Order, not based on budget augmentation or any change in legislation, we hired 700 more fire fighters than we ever had; including 200 statewide for defensible space inspections. We increased our defensible space inspections from 50 thousand to 95 thousand statewide. This means when it is done by Executive Order, it is funded out of emergency fund.

John Pickett wants to know if the emergency fund is reauthorized every single year. He has concerns that the fund could disappear with change in Governor.

Mr. Grijalva explains that the emergency fund is budgeted for about \$85 million a year for the emergency fund. Average yearly spending is about \$200 million. An amount is spent based on an emergency; then you go back to the Legislature and get approval for funding. We may get beat up every once in a while for some of the things we have done but they (Legislature) fund the emergency fund. One of the things we did this year, by adding additional staff, was basically spent \$16 million in advance before the emergency existed. This came out of the Emergency Fund to staff those 700 people statewide and going into October, we were far below our budget, spending about \$50 million. October, though, blew it out of the water.

Mr. Grijalva asks Bill Hoehman: What if either as a result of a recommendation from the Commission to the Governor or an Executive Order by the Governor there was authorized seasonal staffing 24/7 which would be co-located with local government and some additional, do you have the capability of hiring and putting people in here? Do you have the engines? Could that be done in one season, two seasons?

Mr. Hoehman states that it would be hard, but the answer is yes. To do it in short order would be tough, but it could be done. Consideration of purchasing new equipment would need reevaluation of a lot of things.

Mr. Grijalva to Mr. Hoehman: How many people would it take to staff two engines 24/7 in Tahoe Basin? We work 72 hour schedules, as opposed to a 52 hour schedule.

Mr. Hoehman responds that it would take 4 fire chiefs and 9 firefighters.

Mr. Grijalva clarifies that one key criteria of determining SRA to become LRA is 3 structures per acre. There are other elements. Every 5 years, all SRA is supposed to be reevaluated and a determination is made as to whether or not it remains SRA. Every unit is charged with the responsibility of doing the reevaluation. With growth in California and the homes being built in the wildland urban interface, there should be less and less SRA every year. Definitely every 5 years. Do we increase SRA? How can we do that?

Chief Whitelaw responds: You did increase SRA in the Basin about 6-7 years ago when CALFIRE staff came in and reevaluated pockets of LRA and shifted those areas to SRA.

Mr. Grijalva clarifies that if land moves out from SRA to become LRA, that does mean we don't respond and fight fires. That discussion is made with the Department of Finance every year.

Mr. Millar asks that if land, previously under FRA falls out of agreement with CALFIRE and it becomes LRA, who is responsible for protection?

Mr. Grijalva responds that if it becomes LRA, then it becomes local jurisdiction. If local government is making land use decisions and developing in the SRA, then it comes out of SRA and becomes LRA to protect. Not every jurisdiction steps up, they make land use decisions without building the response capability behind it and the State is still accountable for the response. San Diego County is an example, it has no county fire department and it is a mixture of state, major cities and a lot of local fire protection districts, under funded and volunteer. Fresno County also doesn't provide a county fire department and they state it is not their responsibility to provide fire protection, yet they are making the land use decisions. Mr. Grijalva expects that within a year or two the Legislature will make some decision regarding this. Legislators are debating that right now.

Chief Whitelaw asks for clarification on criteria of contracts and level of service required. It appears that when local jurisdiction has the responsibility and decides they can not do the job, they can hire CALFIRE by contract to come in and provide service. That local jurisdiction then decides what level of service is necessary and they will pay CALFIRE for that contract. If the County, i.e. Ventura, LA, etc., decides to handle the service instead of CAL FIRE, CAL FIRE pays the county to do that work and CAL FIRE, I assume, dictates the level of service and protection that the County will provide in

exchange for dollars. If you want that county to do the job, you're telling that county here is the level of service we want you to provide because that is what we would provide if we did it.

Committee Meetings
January 24, 2008

Lake Tahoe Community College
South Lake Tahoe, CA

Mr. Grijalva explains that the County does not decide whether or not they become a contract. The Director, by law, determines if a county becomes a contract county. If you want that county to do the job, you're telling that county here is the level of service we want you to provide because that is what we would provide if we did it.

Mr. Grijalva responds yes, under the SRA portion.

Chief Whitelaw continues that in the Balance of Acres situation, where you say Forest Service you come in and do this and we'll do something for you somewhere else, you leave it the Forest Service to decide a level of service on SRA in California.

Mr. Grijalva responds that we don't necessarily leave it to the Forest Service, we just don't change their policies and they don't change our policies. There is no exchange of money.

Mr. Grijalva invites Joe Millar to come up and speak to question also.

Mr. Grijalva continues, it is for efficiency purposes because of the quilts of land that are jurisdictionally intermixed and to efficiently handle the fire response to those areas. In some cases it is more efficient for the Federal Agency to handle it, some for the State.

Mr. Millar explains that during our preseason meeting with CAL FIRE, when we review the annual operating plan, we exchange resources, protocols, and those types of things. Outside of those meetings when I'm not performing or if by chance CAL FIRE is not responding in the matter we want them to; we have a meeting to discuss this. If you are looking for a 3 engine, dozer and helicopter qualifier, no, there is no level of service for that. There is a level of expectation. Review of dispatch run cards evaluated by contemporaries, processes, organizations, performances are also evaluated.

Chief Whitelaw questions: When CALFIRE, the Director, decides that a county is to handle the SRA and dictates the level of service, an agreed upon a cost. But for the patch work situations where for efficiency sake it is better for the Forest Service to come in, we end with a lower level of service here and this standard that you have set or the Director or CAL FIRE does in general, goes by the wayside. Local government raises the bar to what we perceive what CALFIRE would do on a 24/7 basis based on your agent coming in and performing 8 to 12 hours a day.

Mr. Grijalva explains contracts. CAL FIRE has contracts with local government. It can be a county, city, fire protection district, water district, etc. We currently have 147 contracts. We have 6 counties that we contract with. In both case, the standard that we use is that it must be financially and operationally in the best interest of the State to enter into, as well as for the entity, the contract. There are a number of contracts turned down either because they are not financially or operationally in the best interest of either party. It also can be turned down because of labor negotiations.

Mr. Grijalva explains that the State should not be used as a pawn by local government when contracting with firefighters. We recently turned down a proposal with a city when this occurred. When it comes to contract counties what is looked at is what resources we would put in there. We expect the counties to provide the same level of resources. In most cases, we look for them to provide more because they are supplementing what we would have put there and it costs them more money because they have a 56 hour schedule, and so for them to cover that same area, it is going to cost them more money than we give them as a contract. When we contract with them, we don't pay for Administration and Chief Officers, we just pay for the amount of firefighters, engines and stations that we would have there. So there is cost to a contract county. When a county comes to me and is interested in becoming a contract county and they have not demonstrated that they are going to improve the level of service, that they are just looking for the State to supplement what they do to save them money - I am not going to enter into that agreement. I am not going to name them, but there are a couple of counties that are interested in that, but they are interested for the wrong reasons. This is entirely different than the Balance of Acres. When I raised the question that when we balanced acres years ago, have things changed so substantially as to create a situation where it is not in the interest of the State or Federal Government to have those acres? In my opinion, the Forest Service does a great job everywhere we work with them. There are some limitations based on National policy. But probably for the Tahoe Basin, the best solution is to supplement the system, not tear it down.

Bud Hicks is asking for more clarity on cost. In specific, on page 5 and page 9 of the fire chief's presentation, the difference of cost between Forest Service 8-12 hours a day coverage as opposed to 24/7 by CALFIRE. What is the cost to local government of not having 24/7 protection? Local jurisdiction is saying that they have to pay for that difference themselves.

Mr. Grijalva asks, who are you looking for an answer from?

Mr. Hicks replies CALFIRE because in recommendation #6 it is noted that CALFIRE would come in and provide that and that would relieve the local government of the \$187,000 cost.

Mr. Grijalva responds that one of the reasons the question was raised of how much of the SRA is not within a fire protection district. When you establish a fire protection district, you establish the boundaries to be served and you can draw revenues. If there are areas that are outside a fire protection district and are SRA, clearly this is something we should bear and not local government. But when local government includes them in their boundaries, it becomes their responsibility.

Mr. Grijalva states that some local governments do not like CALFIRE because they think CALFIRE is going to take over local government. His perspective is that he is not a believer in that. Rather that he is a firm believer in local control and local government. Within the state, there are some local government choices to enhance and augment and have higher levels of police and fire protection than other areas. This is entirely within the rights of local government to do so. When CALFIRE goes and gets requests from boards to submit proposals, unions do not like it because if CALFIRE would contract with that local government, the pay is not as high as the State level and there is a different work schedule of 56 hour as opposed to CALFIRE's 72 hour.

It is a balance between meeting the needs of the elected body, meeting the needs of what the local fire chief wants, what the labor group wants, and still providing the best protection that we can for the taxpayer. Those decisions need to be made at the local government level. Local government needs to decide if they are happy with their level of service or if they are not happy with their level of service. Do they want to enhance their level of service by paying for a better level of service or will I be happy with whatever the state provides in the SRA.

The Committee supported the finding of F&R V-009.

Finding: The level of wildland fire protection on SRA is below basic 24/7, all-risk standard experienced elsewhere in California.

Motion made by Bud Hicks to accept finding, 2nd by Bob Davidson. All approved.

F&R V-009 Recommendations

#1 Bring back at later date to discuss

#2 Motion by John Pickett to amend language to include the words "on a permanent basis",
2nd by Bob Davidson

Recommendation #2 now reads as follows:

This Committee recommends that the State of California consider reviewing the level of service on SRA in the Tahoe Basin and adjusting it on a permanent basis to a level that is comparable elsewhere in California. This could include placing engines on the North and South ends of the Lake 24/7 during declared fire season and instructing those engine companies (and potentially forester positions) to participate in PRC 4291 inspections in cooperation with local government.

Motion made by John Pickett, 2nd by Bob Davidson to accept recommendation as amended. All approved.

5. Committee Findings and Recommendations (Discussion/Action)

The Committee reviewed and discussed which findings & recommendations they want a formal presentation on. Each one will be on the agenda for possible action at the next Committee and Commission meeting. All will be discussed for action by the Committee.

The following Findings and Recommendations submitted will be on the next Committee Agenda:

V-010 – Permit Streamlining – Presentation requested. To be given by Wildland Fuel Committee.

V-011 – Level of Protection – No presentation requested. Public comment taken at time of item.

V-013 – Education – No presentation requested. Public comment taken at time of item.

V-014 – Education - No presentation requested. Public comment taken at time of item.

V-017 – Defensible Space – Presentation requested by the Committee - To be given by Mike Vollmer.

Committee Meetings
January 24, 2008

Lake Tahoe Community College
South Lake Tahoe, CA

There was a general discussion of the review and process of the correct template and supporting information to an F&R before placing on agenda. Topic discussion and presentation allowed before completing F&R process.

6. Committee Coordination CFSC#-025

Review of proposed 21 Findings and Recommendations that have been submitted to all committees.

EDC	Emergency Declaration Committee
WFC	Wildland Fuels Committee
CFSC	Community Fire Safety Committee

V-010 Permit streamlining to be included in next agenda.

Duane Shintaku explains that the Committee and full Commission are to have same F&Rs on agenda so if actions are taken by Committee, the Commission can act upon them immediately.

Web access through the Commission website is being worked on so public can have access to information.

7. Open committee discussion

No items discussed.

8. Findings and Recommendations

Recommendation #1

Recommendation brought back for discussion and additional language.

Motion by Bud Hicks to approve Recommendation #1 new language, 2nd by Bob Davidson.
All approved.

The recommendation now reads as follows:

This Committee requests that the Commission recommend to the Governors that they adopt the priorities of life, property and the environment, in that order, with respect to fire safety, fire prevention, and such other matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission. It is further recommended that the Governors of California and Nevada advise and recommend to the TRPA and the various state agencies, having jurisdiction over environmental matters within the Tahoe Basin, that these priorities should be incorporated in the order set forth above to the maximum extent possible in the standards and procedures applied by such agencies within the Basin.

The committee will properly format this finding and recommendation and forward it to the Commission for action.

Committee Meetings
January 24, 2008

Lake Tahoe Community College
South Lake Tahoe, CA

Recommendation #2

Recommendation brought back for discussion.

After discussion, it was noted that there are similarities of language between Recommendation #2 & Recommendation #10, Item 1-C. It was decided not to take any action on this recommendation until Recommendation #10 is reviewed.

Motion made by Bud Hicks, 2nd by Bob Davidson to table. All approved.

John Pickett requests that presentation by Bill Holmes or Brad Harris be given on Recommendation #10, Item 1-C. .

9. There were no Public Comments

10. Findings and Recommendations
No further items discussed.

11. Meeting adjourned 1516